INTRODUCTION

Cytokine-secreting, whole-cell cancer vaccines are currently being investigated for the treatment of solid tumors (1–3). In particular, tumor cells genetically modified to secrete GM-CSF3 induce a systemic tumor antigen-specific T-cell response potent enough to cure mice with preestablished micrometastases (4). GM-CSF recruiting dendritic cells to the vaccine site where they take up and process tumor antigens, subsequently presenting them in a form that can induce effective systemic T-cell responses (5–7). Clinical trials testing both autologous and allogeneic tumor cells engineered to secrete GM-CSF for the treatment of a variety of human cancers have already been completed or are under way (8–11). Although induction of antitumor immunity and clinical responses have been demonstrated in some patients, it is unlikely that this current form of the vaccine is potent enough to be effective in the majority of patients with minimal residual disease or small numbers of metastases (8–11).

Studies aimed at identifying tumor-associated T-cell antigens (12, 13) and understanding antigen-specific T-cell regulation (14–16) have provided new insights into the mechanisms of immune tolerance that may limit the effectiveness of cancer vaccines (17–20). For example, a number of nonmutated, tissue-specific proteins have been identified as T-cell antigens that would otherwise be capable of inducing autoimmunity. This also implies that T cells with lower avidity for these same antigens may have escaped tolerance and are capable of being activated. This would explain reports describing the existence of ineffective antibody and T-cell responses directed at specific antigens expressed by simultaneously progressing cancers in patients (11, 23).

Several groups have observed that some chemotherapeutic agents can modulate the immune response (24–34). A number of reports have demonstrated that some chemotherapeutic agents can enhance the antitumor activity of adoptively transferred T cells (25, 26), tumor vaccines (29, 31), and macrophages (30). For example, it has been known for a long time that pretreatment with agents such as CTX enhances the efficacy of adoptive transfer of antigen-specific lymphocytes and antitumor vaccines (25, 26, 31). The immunopotentiation of T cell-mediated immune response by CTX has been suggested in various animal tumor models as well as in Phase I/II clinical trials (25, 26, 31–33). Mokyr et al. (34) demonstrated that the timing between antigen injection and CTX administration is crucial to potentiate the antitumor immune response. Other studies have revealed the synergistic effect of chemotherapy with passive immunotherapy using the HER-2/neu targeted antibody, trastuzumab (35, 36).

Mice transgenic for the nontransforming rat neu proto-oncone gene expressed under the control of a mammary-specific promoter (neu transgenic mice) develop spontaneous focal mammary adenocarcinomas (37). We described recently the immunological characterization of these mice and found that T-cell tolerance to neu exists in these mice relative to the parental nontransgenic mice (38). Despite the existence of tolerance, it was possible to induce neu-targeted immunity potent enough to overcome this tolerance and significantly delay both transplantable and spontaneously arising tumors. In this report, we have used the neu transgenic mouse model to identify chemotherapeutic agents that, when sequentially with a neu-expressing GM-CSF-secreting whole tumor vaccine, can enhance vaccine efficacy. Our findings show that pretreatment with PTX or CTX increases the vaccine efficacy, in particular the type I antitumoral immune response. Other studies have revealed the synergistic effect of chemotherapy with passive immunotherapy using the HER-2/neu targeted antibody, trastuzumab (35, 36).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Mice. neu transgenic mice developed by Guy et al. (Ref. 37; line 202) were bred to homozygosity as verified by Southern blot analysis. FVB/N mice were...
obtained commercially from The Jackson Laboratory. All experiments involving the use of mice were performed in accordance with protocols approved by the Animal Care and Use Committee of the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine.

**Cell Lines and Media.** NT cells were derived from spontaneous mammary tumors of female neu transgenic mice as described previously (Ref. 38; NT cells are from a neu-expressing tumor cell line derived from spontaneous tumor of neu transgenic mice; NT-B7 are NT cells that human the B7 costimulatory molecule). The NT cell line overexpresses the rat neu cDNA, and these levels remain stable (38). The NT cell line was grown in our defined Breast Media, which consists of RPMI 1640 (Life Technologies, Inc., Grand Island, NY) with 20% FBS (HyClone, Logan, UT), 1% l-glutamine (JRH Biosciences, Lenexa, KS), 1% non-essential amino acids, 1% sodium pyruvate, 0.5% penicillin/streptomycin, 0.02% Gentamicin (Sigma Chemical Co., St. Louis, MO), and 0.2% insulin (Lilly, Indianapolis, IN), and maintained at 37°C in 5% CO2 atmosphere. The NT cell line was expanded to large numbers to produce master cell banks of each line to avoid contamination. NT cells were maintained in DMEM (Life Technologies, Inc., Grand Island, NY) with 10% bovine calf serum (Hyclone) 1%L-glutamine, 1% non-essential amino acids, 1% sodium pyruvate, 0.5% penicillin/streptomycin, 0.02% Gentamicin (Sigma Chemical Co., St. Louis, MO), and 0.2% insulin (Lilly, Indianapolis, IN), and maintained at 37°C in 5% CO2 atmosphere. The NT cell line was expanded to large numbers to produce master cell banks of each line to avoid contamination. NT cells were maintained in our defined Breast Media supplemented with neomycin (Life Technologies, Inc.). The cell line overexpresses the rat neu cDNA, and these levels remain stable (38). The NT cell line was grown in our defined Breast Media, which consists of RPMI 1640 (Life Technologies, Inc., Grand Island, NY) with 20% FBS (HyClone, Logan, UT), 1% l-glutamine (JRH Biosciences, Lenexa, KS), 1% non-essential amino acids, 1% sodium pyruvate, 0.5% penicillin/streptomycin, 0.02% Gentamicin (Sigma Chemical Co., St. Louis, MO), and 0.2% insulin (Lilly, Indianapolis, IN), and maintained at 37°C in 5% CO2 atmosphere. The NT cell line was expanded to large numbers to produce master cell banks of each line to avoid contamination. NT cells were maintained in our defined Breast Media supplemented with neomycin (Life Technologies, Inc.). NT cells were genetically modified to express the murine cytokine GM-CSF using the retroviral vector MFG as described previously (4), resulting in 3T3/GM and 3T3-neu/GM cell lines, respectively (4). 3T3/GM are 3T3 cells that produce murine GM-CSF; 3T3-neu are NIH-3T3 cells that express rat HER-2/neu cDNA; 3T3-neu/GM are 3T3-neu cells that produce murine GM-CSF. Murine GM-CSF production was tested with a commercially available ELISA kit (Endogen, Woburn, MA) and was determined to be between 200 and 250 ng/106 cells/24 h for 3T3/GM and 3T3-neu/GM. GM-CSF bioactivity was confirmed using the GM-CSF-dependent cell line, NFS-60, as described previously (4). Production of GM-CSF by untransduced NT cell line is not detected as determined by ELISA.

**Chemotherapeutic Agents.** PTX (Bristol-Myers Squibb, Princeton, NJ), DOX (Genentech, Irvine, CA), and CIS (Bristol-Myers Squibb) were diluted in HBSS before injection. CTX (Bristol-Myers Squibb) was diluted in sterile water before injection. PTX, CTX, and CIS were injected i.p.; DOX was injected i.v.

**Vaccination and Tumor Challenge.** On the day of vaccination, vaccine cells grown in vitro were trypsinized, washed three times in HBSS (pH 7.4; Life Technologies, Inc.), and counted. The cells were resuspended in HBSS at 106 cells/ml and irradiated with 50 Gy from a 137Cs source (Nordion, Toronto, Ontario, Canada), discharging 1400 rad/min. Eight-week-old neu transgenic or FVB/N mice were given three simultaneous 100-μl s.c. injections (right and left hind limbs and left arm) using a 1-ml tuberculin syringe with a 27-gauge needle (39). The mice in the vaccine group received three simultaneous injections of 106 3T3-neu/GM cells. To ensure that the effect observed was neu specific, all control mice as well as the mice in the chemotherapy group alone received a mock vaccination consisting of three s.c. injections of 106 3T3/GM cells. 3T3/GM mock vaccination did not delay the occurrence of tumor growth compared with mice injected only with HBSS (data not shown). On the day of the tumor challenge, NT cells thawed from frozen bank stores and grown in vitro for 1 or 2 weeks were trypsinized, washed three times in HBSS, and injected into the right upper mammary fat pad. Mice were challenged with 5 × 106 (neu transgenic) or 5 × 105 (FVB/N) NT tumor cells. In treatment experiments, mice were challenged with NT cells on day 0 and vaccinated on day 3 unless otherwise specified. In prevention experiments, mice were challenged with NT cells 2 weeks after vaccination. Tumor occurrence (shown as the tumor-free probability) or changes in tumor growth were monitored twice a week. Changes in tumor growth (mm2) were determined by multiplying the two perpendicular diameters.

Fig. 1. neu-specific vaccination can prevent and treat neu-expressing tumors in the parental FVB/N but not in neu transgenic mice. Parental FVB/N (A) and neu transgenic (C) mice were vaccinated with three simultaneous s.c. injections of 106 3T3-neu/GM vaccine cells (right and left hind limbs and left upper limb) on day 0 and challenged with 5 × 106 (FVB/N mice) or 5 × 104 (neu transgenic mice) NT cells into the right upper mammary fat pad on day 14. In a treatment experiment, a second group of parental FVB/N (B) and neu transgenic (D) mice were first implanted with 5 × 106 (FVB/N) or 5 × 104 (neu transgenic mice) NT cells into the right upper mammary fat pad. FVB/N mice were vaccinated 2 weeks later, and neu transgenic mice were vaccinated 1 day later with three simultaneous s.c. injections of 106 3T3-neu/GM into the right and left hind limbs and left upper limb. All mice were monitored twice a week for a change in tumor growth. Plotted is the mean of the products of the two perpendicular diameters (mm2) for five to eight mice/group as a function of days after tumor implantation; bars, SE. Control mice in each study received similar injections with the 3T3/GM mock vaccine. Similar results were obtained in four independent experiments. *, controls 3T3/GM (mock vaccine); △, vaccination 3T3-neu/GM. **, P < 0.05 as determined by unpaired Student’s t test. **
CHEMOTHERAPY AND VACCINE SYNERGISM IN TOLERIZED MICE

Table 1  Dose- and schedule-dependent associations between chemotherapy and the GM-CSF secreting whole-cell vaccine in FVB/N mice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T cell count (nadir) number/µl ± SD</th>
<th>Chemotherapy 1 day before vaccine</th>
<th>Chemotherapy 7 days after vaccine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 mg/kg</td>
<td>6128 ± 847</td>
<td>+/–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 mg/kg</td>
<td>5120 ± 1033</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 mg/kg</td>
<td>1559 ± 356</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 mg/kg</td>
<td>1100 ± 478</td>
<td>+/–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 mg/kg</td>
<td>989 ± 122</td>
<td>+/–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 mg/kg</td>
<td>4365 ± 501</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 mg/kg</td>
<td>4200 ± 675</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 mg/kg</td>
<td>3600 ± 543</td>
<td>+/–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 mg/kg</td>
<td>3451 ± 345</td>
<td>+/–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 mg/kg</td>
<td>6265 ± 1298</td>
<td>+/–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 mg/kg</td>
<td>5586 ± 945</td>
<td>+/–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 mg/kg</td>
<td>4180 ± 501</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 mg/kg</td>
<td>6320 ± 903</td>
<td>+/–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 mg/kg</td>
<td>6200 ± 674</td>
<td>+/–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 mg/kg</td>
<td>3679 ± 455</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 mg/kg</td>
<td>3400 ± 697</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 FVB/N mice were implanted with 5 × 10⁶ NT cells in the right upper mammary fat pad on day 0. Groups of 5–10 mice received either: (a) HBSS as a control; (b) 3T3-neu/GM vaccine cells; (c) chemotherapy; or (d) chemotherapy and 3T3/GM vaccine cells. 3T3-neu/GM vaccine cells were injected s.c. at three sites (10⁶ cells/site), the left and right hind limb and left upper limb, on day 3. All mice were monitored twice a week for a change in tumor growth as determined by multiplying the two perpendicular diameters. P was determined by unpaired Student’s t test.

4 Blood was drawn 4 days after chemotherapy administration (nadir), and T cells were automatically counted (ANTECH Diagnostics, New York). Data shown are the mean of T cell counts for three mice at day 4 after chemotherapy injection (nadir).

 Results

A neu-targeted Vaccine Is Highly Effective at Preventing and Treating neu-expressing Tumors in Parental FVB/N but not in neu-Transgenic Mice.

We have shown previously that neu transgenic mice demonstrate immune tolerance to neu; the dose of tumor cells required for tumor growth in 100% of animals was at least 100-fold lower for the neu transgenic mice when compared with parental FVB/N mice (38). Nontransgenic and neu transgenic mice were compared for their ability to respond to a neu and GM-CSF expressing whole-cell vaccine (3T3-neu/GM) given before or after a tumor challenge with NT tumor cells. Nontransgenic FVB/N mice vaccinated once with 3T3-neu/GM demonstrated an impressive antitumor response capable of preventing and treating large tumor burdens (Fig. 1, A and B). neu transgenic mice given the same vaccine demonstrated a small but significant and reproducible delay in transplantable tumor growth when the tumor challenge was given 2 weeks after the vaccine (Fig. 1C). However, in treatment experiments, a statistical difference in the rate of tumor growth between the control and the vaccine groups was not detected in neu transgenic mice, even if the vaccine was administered as early as 1 day after the tumor challenge (Fig. 1D). These results provide further evidence that the neu transgenic mice demonstrate an immune tolerance to neu.

Identification of a Chemotherapy Dose Range and Sequence of Administration That May Enhance the Antitumor Effects of the 3T3-neu/GM Vaccine.

The data presented in Fig. 1 show that our vaccine approach is potent enough to eradicate large established tumor burdens in a host that does not exhibit antigen-specific immune tolerance to tumor. In contrast, the same vaccine is not potent enough to prevent tumor development in the neu transgenic mice (38, 41). Therefore, immune-modulating agents that can overcome the mechanisms of tolerance may enhance the effectiveness of neu-specific immunization.

One immune-modulating approach is to test selected chemotherapy agents at non-immune-suppressing doses for their ability to enhance the potency of the vaccine. We therefore tested four chemotherapeutic agents (CTX, DOX, PTX, and CIS) in combination with the 3T3-neu/GM vaccine. These four drugs were chosen for evaluation for three reasons: (a) these agents are commonly used for the treatment of human cancers; (b) each drug represents a different class of chemotherapeutic agents and would be expected to interact with the vaccine by distinctly different mechanisms; and (c) there are data in the literature suggesting that each of these agents have immune-modulating effects (24–34, 42, 43).

Initially, feasibility studies were performed in FVB/N mice to identify a dose range and optimal sequence of administration for each chemotherapeutic agent when combined with the vaccine. Mice were given 5 × 10⁶ NT cells inoculated into the right upper mammary fat pad on day 0 and vaccinated 3 days later with three simultaneous s.c. injections of 1 × 10⁶ irradiated 3T3-neu/GM cells given into the left and right hind limbs and the left upper limb. Each of the four chemotherapeutic agents were given either 1 day prior to vaccination (at the time of immune priming) or 7 days after vaccination (at the time of initial T-cell activation and expansion). Table 1 summarizes the dose range for each agent used as well as the type of effect observed.

When either PTX (dose range between 20 and 30 mg/kg) or CTX (dose range between 50 and 150 mg/kg) were given prior to the vaccine, the combination of chemotherapy plus vaccine was better to control tumor growth than treatment with either modality alone (Table 1). However, when these two chemotherapeutic agents were given at the same doses 7 days after vaccination, the combination chemotherapy/vaccine was not superior to chemotherapy alone. In contrast, DOX (dose <10 mg/kg) and CIS (dose <5 mg/kg) neither inhibited nor significantly enhanced the potency of the vaccine when given either 1 day before or 1 week after vaccination.

CTX, PTX, and DOX Enhance the Antitumor Effects of the Vaccine and Significantly Delay Transplantable Tumor Progression in neu-Transgenic Mice.

Next, we tested the dose and schedule of each chemotherapeutic agent found to be effective in the nontolerized mice for the ability to enhance the potency of the vaccine in the neu
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transgenic mice. Mice were inoculated with $5 \times 10^4$ NT cells in the right upper mammary fat pad on day 0 and vaccinated 3 days later. As shown in Fig. 2, when either CTX or PTX was given 1 day before vaccination, they enhanced the potential of the vaccine to delay tumor growth. In contrast, DOX had no effect when administered prior to vaccination but could enhance the antitumor effect when administered 1 week after the vaccination. CIS was the only drug of the four that did not appear to enhance the antitumor immune response of the vaccine at all at the dose range and schedules studied (data not shown).

Because CTX and PTX enhance the effect of the vaccine at a different time point than DOX, it is likely that the mechanisms by which they interact with the vaccine also differ. If this is indeed the case, then it is possible that administering either CTX or PTX in sequence with both the vaccine and DOX would further enhance the antitumor immune response in the neu transgenic mice. We therefore tested the combination of CTX (100 mg/kg) and DOX (5 mg/kg) given, respectively, 1 day before and 7 days after vaccination. This polychemotherapy regimen induced a mild leukopenia ranging between 4000 and 5000 WBCs (normal between 8,000 and 12,000). As shown in Fig. 3, the association of CTX/DOX and vaccine was significantly more effective at controlling the tumor occurrence than either treatment modality alone. This polychemotherapy/vaccine regimen cured 20% of the neu transgenic mice in two similar experiments and was better to control tumor growth than CTX/vaccine or DOX/vaccine (data not shown).

Chemotherapy Appears to Enhance the Potency of the neu-targeted Vaccine through a Mechanism Distinct from Direct Tumor Lysis. Prevention experiments were performed to determine whether the mechanism by which the chemotherapeutic agents enhance the efficacy of the vaccine is through direct tumor killing or through amplification of the antitumor immune response. Mice received three simultaneous s.c. injections of $10^5$ 3T3-neu/GM vaccine in the right and left hind limbs and right upper limb on day 0. PTX or CTX were given i.p. 1 day prior and DOX was given i.v. 7 days after vaccination. All mice were challenged with $5 \times 10^4$ NT cells 14 days after vaccination. This experimental design makes it unlikely that the chemotherapy can directly reduce the tumor burden because the chemotherapy dose was administered 7 days prior to tumor challenge for DOX and 15 days prior to tumor challenge for PTX and CTX.
have described previously the importance of CD4+ T cells in neu transgenic mice. Between 10 and 14 mice/group (pooled from two independent experiments) received either: (a) controls 3T3/GM (mock vaccine); (b) 3T3-neu/GM vaccine alone; (c) polychemotherapy and 3T3-neu/GM vaccine; or (d) polychemotherapy and 3T3-neu/GM vaccine. NT cells (5 × 10^6) were implanted in the right mammary fat pad on day 0. Vaccination (3T3-neu/GM or 3T3/GM) was given at three sites (10^6 cells/site), the left and right hind limbs and left upper limb, on day 3. The chemotherapy consisted of i.p. 100 mg CTX on day 2 (1 day prior to the vaccine) and i.v. 5 mg/kg DOX on day 10 (7 days after the vaccine). All mice were monitored twice a week for tumor occurrence.  

CTX and PTX appear to specifically enhance the Th1 response of the 3T3-neu/GM vaccine in neu transgenic mice. Between 5 and 8 neu transgenic mice were vaccinated s.c. with 3T3-neu/GM cells given at three sites (10^6 cells/site), the left and right hind limbs and left upper limb, with and without chemotherapy. Mice were challenged with NT cells, followed 3 days later with either a 3T3-neu/GM vaccine or a mock vaccination (3T3/GM), CTX, PTX, and DOX were given either 1 day before the vaccine or 1 week after the vaccine. The mice were sacrificed 12 days after vaccine administration, and unfractioned T cells were isolated from the spleen as described in “Materials and Methods.” As shown in Fig. 5, CTX and PTX administered 1 day before the vaccine increased the number of neu-specific T cells when compared with mice that received 3T3-neu/GM vaccine alone. PTX and CTX injected after the vaccine significantly decreased the number of neu-specific T cells when compared with the mice that received vaccine alone. In contrast, DOX given 1 day before the vaccine or 1 week after the vaccine did not decrease or increase the number of neu-specific T cells. This supports the hypothesis that the DOX given after the vaccine increased its efficacy through a different mechanism than PTX or CTX.

CTX and PTX Apeare to Specifically Enhance the Th1 Response of the 3T3-neu/GM Vaccine in neu-Transgenic Mice. We have described previously the importance of CD4+ T cells in orchestrating the host response to tumor after vaccination with whole-cell vaccines engineered to secrete GM-CSF (4, 38, 44). To study the Th1 and Th2 balance in neu transgenic mice given chemotherapy in sequence with the vaccine, IFN-γ and IL-4 ELISPOT analyses were performed on CD4+ T cells isolated and purified from spleen 12 days after vaccination. As shown in Fig. 6, the Th1 but not the Th2 response was increased when PTX or CTX were given before a 3T3-neu/GM vaccine compared with the group that received the vaccine only. In contrast, DOX given after the vaccine did not increase or decrease the Th1 or Th2 response (data not shown). These data therefore suggest that CTX and PTX, when given prior to the vaccine, enhance the Th1 T-cell response.

**Discussion**

The data presented in this study support the following two conclusions: (a) CTX, PTX, and DOX, when given in a defined sequence with a murine GM-CSF secreting neu-expressing whole-cell vaccine, enhance the potential of the vaccine to delay tumor growth in tolerized neu transgenic mice. The optimal immune-modulating dose for each chemotherapeutic agent appears to be just above doses that begin to induce cytopenias; and (b) the enhanced antitumor response appears to be mediated, at least in part, by an increase in number and function of antigen-specific T cells (CTX and PTX), in particular the Th1 response. These findings suggest that combined treatment with immune-modulating doses of chemotherapy and the GM-CSF-secreting neu vaccine can overcome immune tolerance and induce a more potent antigen-specific antitumor immune response than vaccine alone.

**neu** transgenic mice offer the opportunity to test vaccine strategies in the context of tumor-specific immune tolerance (38). Our previous studies have demonstrated that neu transgenic mice exhibit a neu-specific immune tolerance similar to what is observed in patients with breast cancers that overexpress HER-2/neu (38). Although neu-targeted vaccination was able to eradicate large burdens of preestablished tumors in the nontolerized parental mice in this study, these same vaccines could only significantly delay the development of transplantable neu-expressing tumors in a prevention model in the neu transgenic mice (38). Furthermore, we did not observe a significant difference in tumor growth between the control and vaccine groups in the treatment experiments. This reinforces data reported previously demonstrating that tumor vaccines alone have a limited potential for the treatment of measurable tumor burdens and highlights the importance of identifying more potent vaccine strategies for clinical testing.

We evaluated the possible integration of chemotherapy and vaccine to treat transplantable mammary tumors in neu transgenic mice. We found that, when given in the proper sequence and at immune-modulating doses, systemic administration of CTX, PTX, and DOX can enhance rather than inhibit the antitumor immunity generated by the vaccine. The fact that this finding is also observed in prevention experiments in which...
the tumor challenge is given 7 days after the last dose of chemotherapy suggests that the antitumor effect cannot be explained only by a direct chemotherapy-induced cytolytic effect on the tumor cells. Rather, CTX, PTX, and DOX appear to also have a direct immune augmenting effect. This immune-enhancing effect appears to be attributable in part to an augmentation of the number and activity of antigen-specific T cells. Furthermore, the data suggest that PTX and CTX may amplify the Th1 T-cell response. In contrast to CTX and PTX, DOX does not appear to significantly enhance the number of neu-specific T cells in our model. It is still possible that it acts by enhancing T-cell function. However, alternative mechanisms, including recruitment and activation of professional antigen-presenting cells, and enhancement of innate immune responses also require consideration.

Previous studies have already demonstrated that pretreatment with CTX prior to T-cell adoptive transfer enhances T-cell efficacy (25–26). There are also reports suggesting that CTX can enhance the antitumor immune response of whole-cell vaccination in the clinic (31) and induce a Th1 immune response in tumor models (45). Other studies have suggested that pretreatment with CTX can overcome tolerance (46, 47). Yoshida et al. (46) successfully provoked significant delayed-type hypersensitivity footpad reactions against syngeneic and autologous testicular cells in mice pretreated with CTX. In addition, Polak et al. (47) demonstrated that acquired tolerance to 2,4-dinitrochlorobenzene can be reversed by a single treatment with CTX just prior to administration of the allergen. Our results are consistent with these earlier findings and confirm that CTX can break tolerance and augment the antigen-specific antitumor immune response induced by a GM-CSF-secreting whole-cell vaccine in a murine model that exhibits tumor-specific tolerance. However, an earlier study performed by our group failed to demonstrate a synergistic effect between pretreatment with CTX and immunization with a GM-CSF-secreting whole-cell vaccine in the murine CT26 colorectal carcinoma model (29). The discrepancy between the results of the earlier study and this current study may be explained in part by the difference in the tumor models, because tolerance has not been demonstrated in the CT26 tumor system. In fact, the interactions of each chemotherapeutic agent with vaccine were more evident in the neu transgenic mice than in the parental FVB/N mice. The differences may also be explained by the timing and dose of CTX tested in the two studies (29).

The exact mechanisms by which CTX enhances antitumor immunity are still undergoing debate. Many studies have reported that CTX may delete or inhibit tumor-induced suppressor or immunoregulatory T cells (48, 49). Others have suggested that CTX may release soluble factors, which may sustain the proliferation, survival, and activity of the transferred immune T cells (26). Recently, Schiavoni and colleagues (50, 51)
Fig. 6. PTX and CTX appear to enhance the Th1 response of a 3T3-neu/GM vaccine in neu transgenic mice. To study the Th1 and Th2 balance in neu transgenic mice given chemotherapy in sequence with the vaccine, IFN-γ (A and C) and IL-4 (B and D) ELISPOT analyses were performed on CD4+ T cells. NT tumor cells (5 × 10⁶) were implanted in the right upper mammary fat pad on day 0, and mice were vaccinated on day 3. Vaccination (3T3-neu/GM or 3T3/GM) was given s.c. at three sites (10⁶ cells/site), the left and right hind limbs and left upper limb. Mice were sacrificed 12 days after the administration of the vaccine, and the CD4+ T cells were isolated from spleen as described in “Materials and Methods.” ELISPOT analysis was performed as described in “Materials and Methods.” Four mice per group received either: (a) controls-3T3/GM (mock vaccine); (b) 3T3-neu/GM vaccine alone; (c) chemotherapy and s.c. vaccine; or (d) chemotherapy and 3T3-neu/GM vaccine. Plotted are the mean (three wells/condition) of the number of spots counted in the wells containing the T cells and the stimulators cells minus the number of spots counted in the well containing the T cells alone; bars, SD. NT-B7 stimulator cells do not give any background (data not shown). P was determined by unpaired Student’s t test between the vaccine group and the chemotherapy + vaccine group.
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